

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 207/TT/2012**

Subject : Determination of transmission tariff of Elements from DOCO to 31.3.2014 for assets (6 nos. bus reactors-Part IV) under Common Scheme for 765 kV Pooling Stations and Network for NR, Import by NR from ER and common scheme for network for WR and Import by WR from ER and from NER/SR/WR via ER in Northern Region for tariff block 2009-14.

Date of Hearing : 29.5.2014

Coram : Shri Gireesh B.Pradhan, Chairperson  
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member  
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

Respondents : Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd. and 16 others

Parties present : Shri S. K. Venkatesan, PGCIL  
Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL  
Shri R. B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL  
Shri Padamjit Singh, PSPCL  
Shri J. K. Bilkha, RVPNJPR

**Record of Proceedings**

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the instant petition is for determination of transmission tariff for six assets under Common Scheme for 765 kV Pooling Stations and Network for NR, Import by NR from ER and common scheme for network for WR and Import by WR from ER and from NER/SR/WR via ER in Northern Region for tariff block 2009-14. He submitted that as per the Investment Approval dated 29.8.2008, the instant assets are to be commissioned progressively in 48 months from the date of Investment Approval. Accordingly, the assets are to be commissioned before August, 2012. The assets are commissioned before time progressively from 1.4.2012 to 1.6.2012. He submitted that out of six covered in the instant petition, the completion cost of four assets is within the apportioned approved cost and there is cost over-run in case of two assets. He submitted that the detailed justification for increase in cost of the two assets have been filed vide affidavits dated 10.7.2013 and 24.3.2014.



2. The representative of PSPCL, Respondent No.6, has submitted that the first line in the Scheme is Maithon-Gaya 400 kV DC Quad line and without commissioning this first line the petitioner is claiming transmission tariff for 6 assets, in the instant petition, which are at the end point. As per the scheme, the 400 kV double circuit Quad line from Koderma and double circuit from Maithon are pooled at Gaya substation and stepped up to 765 kV and one line goes to Fatehpur and other lines to Balia. The petitioner is seeking transmission tariff for the assets located at Fatehpur, Lucknow and Balia, without the Maithon-Gaya 400 kV DC Quad line being commissioned. He submitted that major changes have been made in the Scheme and these changes have not been reflected in the petition. He also submitted that as per the DOCO letter dated 13.6.2012, the 400kV 125 MVAR Bus Reactor-III at Agra was charged on 31.5.2012 at 2342 hours and declared under commercial operation after 18 minutes which is too short a period to energise a bus reactor. He submitted the date of commercial operation should be 1.7.2012 and not 1.6.2012 as claimed by the petitioner. The representative of PSPCL further submitted that there is difference in the apportioned approved cost and the estimated completion cost of the instant assets and the petitioner should clarify the same.

3. The learned counsel for BRPL, Respondent no. 12, submitted that the layout of the transmission scheme has been changed and these changes should have been communicated to the beneficiaries. Fresh system studies may have to be conducted in view of the changes made to the transmission scheme. As per Form 5C, enclosed along with the petition, there is time over-run in execution of the contracts by the contractor and the liquidated damages realized from the contractors in this regard should be adjusted in the capital cost. The initial spares claimed in case of Asset I is more than the norms specified in the 2009-14 Tariff Regulations and it should be restricted to the specified norms.

4. In response to the issues raised by PSPCL and BRPL, the representative of the petitioner clarified that the assets were commissioned as per the plan and there is no change in the scheme. He also submitted that the cost variation is due to the cost of sub-station equipment, ratings of the reactors and the local site conditions.

5. The Commission observed that the cost of one of the 125 MVAR reactors is `23 cr. whereas the other is `14 cr. and directed the petitioner to give reasons for such a huge variation.

6. The Commission directed the respondents, who were not present during the hearing, to file their reply, if any, by 22.6.2014 and the petitioner to file its rejoinder by 30.6.2014. The petitioner was also directed to file a detailed reply to the issues raised during the hearing and its rejoinder to the replies filed by PSPCL and BRPL.

7. Subject to the above, order in the petition was reserved by the Commission.

By order of the Commission

sd/-  
(T. Rout)  
Chief Legal

